Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





Jup

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BURMAN OF HOME ECONOMICS in cooperation with

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture,
Ohio Wesleyan University, University of Missouri, University of
Kentucky, Kansas State Agricultural College
and The Farmer's Wife

AVERAGE QUANTITY, COST AND NUTRITIVE VALUE OF FOOD CONSUMED BY FARM FAMILIES

Food Consumed During One Year by 1331 Farm Families of Selected Localities in Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio

-----000-----

H = = = - 1

A Preliminary Report

----000----



AVERAGE QUANTITY, COST AND NUTRITIVE VALUE OF FOOD CONSUMED BY FARM FAMILIES

Food Consumed during One Year by 1531 Farm Families of Selected Localities in Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Chio

Edith Hawley
Food Economist, Bureau of Home Economics
U. S. Department of Agriculture

During the year 1923, food consumption records were collected from 1231 families in Ohio, Kansas, Kentucky, and Missouri. These form part of a larger study of the standard of living on the farms of the United States which is being made by the Bureaus of Agricultural Economics and of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. The results of parts of this study have already appeared in preliminary reports issued by the Eureaus of Agricultural Economics and Home Economics, but this is the first detailed report that has been made of the food habits on the farm.

Records suitable for use were collected from 403 Kansas families in the four counties, Riley, Pratt, Sedgwick, and Cherokee; 365 families in Mason County, Kentucky; 178 families in six counties of Misseuri - Lafayette, Clay, Saline, Callaway, Jackson, and Lincoln; and 382 families in Delaware County, Ohio. In each case the record covers a year's food consumption. In Kansas and Missouri the records are for the year 1923. In Kentucky they cover the year ending July 1, 1923, and in Ohio, the year ending October 1, 1923.

Method of Collecting and Analyzing Food Consumption Data

The figures on food consumption presented in this report were collected by the survey method. A schedule was prepared by the Bureaus of Home Economics and of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture

for use in collecting the data. Specially trained agents, drawn chiefly from the advanced students of the agricultural college or university or from the county home demonstration agents of the state in which the study was made, visited the housewives and with the help of this schedule obtained the desired information from them. This included data not only on food consumption but on all items that go to make up the family living. The food data that were collected covered the expenditures for food and also the quantity of each foodstuff, both furnished by the farm and purchased. The prices for foodstuffs that appear in the schedules are not strictly comparable. The prices recorded for purchased foods were those paid by the housewife at the grocery or market. The foodstuffs furnished by the farm were valued at prices somewhere between what would have been received had they been sold and what would have been paid had they been purchased in the local market.

The families included in the study were chosen by a house to house canvass and are probably typical of the locality in which they resided. Each house-hold had an adult male acting as farm operator and an adult female as homemaker. The number of children living at home ranged from none to eight. The average households in the different states were of the following sizes; Kansas, 4.6 persons; Kentucky and Missouri, 4.3 persons; and Ohio, 4.4. The average for all the states was 4.4 persons. In calculating these figures all members of the family who were receiving their support from the family income and the hired help and relatives who lived with the family more than six months were included.

In arriving at comparable food consumption figures, however, it is necessary to allow for differences in consumption according to sex, age, and activity. This is usually done by the use of a dietary scale in which the needs 90 (8-5-26)

of the women and children are expressed in terms of man's requirement. The number of adult-male units included in the study was calculated by the use of a double dietary scale which has been worked out in the Bureau of Home Economics. In all of the studies made heretofore a single scale based on energy requirement alone has been employed. Recent work on the nutritive requirement of the child has brought out the fact that the growing child needs relatively more protein and minerals than the adult male. In order to provide for this need when analyzing the family diet two dietary scales are necessary, one for the energy need of the family, the other for its protein and mineral needs. The double scale used in this study is as follows:

	Age	For energy	For protein and minerals
Adult male	18 to 60	1.2	1.1
Adult male	Over 60	1.0	1.0
Adult female	18 to 60	1.0	0.9
Adult female	Over 60	0.8	0.8
Воу	15 to 18	1.2	1.6
Girl	15 to 18	0.9	1.2
Child	11 to 14	0.9	1.2
Child	6 to 10	0.7	0.9
Child	Under 6	0.4	0.6

The term adult-male unit, usually expressed as 1.0, refers to the mutritive requirement of a moderately active man weighing 150 pounds. Because of the relatively great activity of adults on the farm the factor 1.2 was used to express the energy need of the man, and instead of the usual factor 0.8 for the woman, 1.0 was employed. The factors 1.1 and 0.9 were used respectively to indicate their protein and their mineral need.

In calculating the number of adult-male units in the families studied, any person who lived in the home more than two weeks of the year was counted 90 (8-5-26)

for the time he was present. That is, if a hired man lived for three months in the home, his energy requirement was considered as 0.3, or one-fourth that of an adult-male. By the use of this double scale it was found that the average farm family's energy need was equivalent to that of 4.2 adult-male units, and its need of protein and mineral to that of 4.3 adult-male units. For the individual states the family sizes in terms of energy need were as follows: Kansas and Kentucky, 4.3 adult-male units; Missouri and Ohio, 4.0 adult-male units. The family's need of protein and minerals was somewhat higher. In Kansas and Kentucky it was equivalent to that of 4.4 adult-male units, and in Missouri and Ohio to that of 4.2 adult-male units.

The food consumption data, tabulated with the help of E. L. Kirkpatrick of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture and the publishers of The Farmer's Wife of St. Paul, Minnesota, are presented in Tables 5 to 9 arranged according to states and all states combined. Consumption figures in pounds and cost are given for the eighty-five foodstuffs included in the farm fliet in terms of the amount used per year by the average family and by the average adult-male unit. These were obtained by dividing the total amount consumed by the total number of families and by the total number of adult-male units for energy included in the study. The number of families that used each foodstuff and the proportion of each foodstuff purchased are also given.

^{1.} The persons included in this calculation differ somewhat from those included in ascertaining the number of persons per average family (p.2).

^{2.} The foodstuffs that were used in negligible amounts were classed as "other foods." These include such food materials as coconut, catsup, etc.

^{90 (8-5-26)}

These food consumption figures were also analyzed to find their nutritive value and the distribution of energy among the food groups. The total nutritive value of the average family's diet was calculated in terms of energy, protein, calcium, phosphorus, and iron. The amount of nutrients available per adult-male unit was then obtained by dividing the total energy yield by the factor 4.2, which expresses the energy need of the average family, and by dividing the total protein, calcium, phosphorus, and iron furnished by the diet by the factor 4.3, which expresses its protein and mineral need in terms of adult-male units. The adequacy of the diet was then estimated by comparing the results obtained, after reducing those figures to the per-day basis, with the following standard: 3300 calories, 82 grams protein, 0.77 gram calcium, 1.45 grams phosphorus, and 0.0165 gram iron. An allowance of 10 per cent for waste is made in this standard.

The Food Habits of Farm Families in Four States

From Tables 5 to 8 it is possible to get some idea of the differences in food habits in the four states. Beef, potatoes, dried fruits, beans, and peas were used in larger quantities on the farms of Kansas and Ohio. Wentucky and Missouri led in the consumption of pork, bacon, lard, molasses, and corn meal - foods which usually play an important part in the southern diet. Milk, cream, eggs, and poultry were consumed in larger quantities in Missouri and Kansas. Chio and Missouri led in the consumption of purchased bread, but when bread is expressed as equivalent flour, the wheat consumption in the four states was similar. There were differences, of course, among the other

^{3.} H. C. Sherman, Chemistry of Food and Nutrition, 2nd edition, rev., p. 383. 90 (8-5-26)

foodstuffs, but these were not outstanding. There is evidence, however, that fresh vegetables and fruits were consumed in larger quantities in Missouri and Ohio than in Kenses and Kentucky.

The nutrients yielded per man per day by the average diet and the distribution of energy among the six food groups are presented in Tables 1 and 2, for the four states and for all of the states combined, together with standards of good nutrition. A comparison of these figures shows that the food reported as consumed on the farm furnishes considerably more nutrients than are estimated as needed. The greatest excess occurred in Missouri and the smallest in Ohio. Calcium is relatively most abundant in all the states, and protein comes second. This is caused by the large amount of meat, oggs, cheese, milk, and cream reported. According to Table 2 these foods were consumed in much larger quantities than would be considered necessary for good nutrition. The fatty foods, sweets, and cereals are present in about the same excess as the total calories - 30 per cent. The average amount of fruits and vegetables consumed is slightly below the standard. The proportion of total calories yielded by the various food groups indicates the same situation. The two groups, meat, eggs, and cheese, and milk and cream furnish a larger preportion of the energy than in the standard, whereas fruits and vegetables furnish less. The proportion of fatty foods, sweets, and cereals is about the same in the two diets.

Before concluding that these figures give a true picture of the average farm diet it is necessary to consider the errors which they may be concealing. The figures on which the analysis is based are estimates made by the housewife of the amount of food consumed during the past year by her family.

90 (8-5-26)

Table 1. Nutritive value of the average dict in three food consumption studies in terms of energy, protein, calcium, phosphorus, and iron, compared with a standard of good nutrition

the second section of the second	Steel seeming (Seems	aprovince and an extension of the second		-		-			
-		Mutri	cive val	us per	man pe	r day			
Ener	gy	Pro	tein	Cal	.cium	Phosp	horus	Iron	
	: % of			,	4		4		% of
Cal-	stand-		.1-		14	Grams	stand~	Grams	stand-
		:	ard		ard		ard		ard
3300	100	82	100	0.77	100	1.45	100	0,0165	100
	:				* *		;		
4385	133	131	160	1.32	171	2.21	152	0,022	: 133
4590	133	116	141	1.13	147	1.89	130	0.019	115
4989	151	137	167	1.50	195	2.38	164	0.024	145
4045.	123	109	133	1.08	140	1.87	129	0.021	127
4370	132	121	148	1.22	158	2.05	141	0,021	127
4260	129	128	156	1.15	150	2.12	146	0.023	: 139
*2741	83	82					, _	0.014	85
	0al- 0ries 3300 4385 4590 4989 4045 4370 4260	Energy % of Cal- stend-ories and 3300 100 4385 133 4590 133 4589 151 4045 123 4260 129	Energy Pro	Energy Protein % of % of Cal- stend-Grams stand-ard 3300 100 82 100 4385 133 131 160 4590 133 116 141 4589 151 137 167 4045 123 109 133 4370 132 121 148 4260 129 128 156	Energy Protein Cal % of % of Grams Cal- stend-Grams stand-Grams Grams 3300 100 82 100 0.77 4385 133 131 160 1.32 4590 133 116 141 1.13 4989 151 137 167 1.50 4045 123 109 133 1.08 4370 132 121 148 1.22 4260 129 128 156 1.15	Energy Protein Calcium % of Cal- stend-Grams standaries and ard % of Grams standard % of Grams standard 3300 100 82 100 0.77 100 4385 133 131 160 1.32 171 4590 133 116 141 1.13 147 4589 151 137 167 1.50 195 4045 123 109 133 1.08 140 4370 132 121 148 1.22 158 4260 129 128 156 1.15 150	Cal-stend-Grams % of standard 3300 100 82 100 0.77 100 1.45 4385 133 131 160 1.32 171 2.21 4590 133 116 141 1.13 147 1.89 4589 151 137 167 1.50 195 2.38 4045 123 109 133 1.08 140 1.87 4370 132 121 148 1.22 158 2.05 4260 129 128 156 1.15 150 2.12	Energy Protein Calcium Phosphorus % of Cal- stend-Grams stand-ories and ard % of Grams stand-ard % of Grams stand-ard Grams stand-ard 3300 100 82 100 0.77 100 1.45 100 4385 133 131 160 1.32 171 2.21 152 4590 133 116 141 1.13 147 1.89 130 4589 151 137 167 1.50 195 2.38 164 4045 123 109 133 1.08 140 1.87 129 4370 132 121 148 1.22 158 2.05 141 4260 129 128 156 1.15 150 2.12 146	Energy Protein Calcium Phosphorus Iron % of % of % of % of Grams Grams <t< td=""></t<>

Table 2. The distribution of energy among the various food groups in three food consumption studies compared with a standard of good nutrition

		,Eggs,		ilk, ceam	Fat		Swee	ets	Cere	218	Frui	ts,
	Cal. per	. 1 -	Cal.	1 0	Cal.	120	Cal.	1 0	Cal.	11 2	Cal.	1 0
_	man			1.1					also and		man	
	per	al	per	al	1		+		. 1001		per	_
-	gch _	Col.	day	_Cal	de y	:Cal.	day -	Cale	day	Cal.	day	Cali
Standard*	460	14-15	360	10-12	620	20-17	350	10-11	038	28-25	: 630	18-20
Present study		,		:	:	•			4	*		
Kansas	692	16	771	17	663	15	: 431	10	1268	29	560	13
Kentucky	789	13	578	13	925	2.1	469	11	1204	27	425	10
Missouri	: 842	17	899	18	878	18	486	10	1213	24	671	13
Ohio	603		512	13	: 664	16	524	13	1100	27	642	16
All 4 States	713	-	661	,	764	13	476	11	1.195	27	561	13
Funk**			4200.		710		: 500	,	,280		790	
Labor Statistics**	370	14	204	7	491	18	250	9	10€5	39	361	13
	1		-	:		,		1 4 =				•

^{*} This standard allows 10 per cent for waste of foodstuffs in the home.

^{**} See footnotes, page 10.

In order to analyze them it was necessary to express them in terms of weight. For many foodstuffs the housewife gave a consumption figure in volumetric terms. For instance, the amount of peaches was sometimes given by the basket, apples by the box, potatoes by the bushel. In some cases less standardized terms were used, such as number of watermelons and bunches of onions. For the analysis, these figures had to be reduced to pounds, and it is quite possible that for some foods the conversion factor used was not correct.

Furthermore, the figures are for foods as purchased. Average refuse values, as given by Atwater and Bryant for the various foodstuffs, were assumed in calculating the amount of nutrients available, but the waste in preparation for cooking may be greater for many of the foodstuffs used on the farm than that found by Atwater. This might be caused by the family's using the foods of poorer grade. The best grade of potatoes, for instance, may have been sold and those less uniform in size and quality used for the family. This would result in a larger amount of refuse than was assumed in our calculations.

The figures themselves as reported by the housewife may also contain appreciable errors, although every effort was made by the investigators to obtain accurate estimates. Studies of the amount of foodstuffs furnished by the farm have indicated that from 60 to 65 per cent, measured in terms of energy, are commonly furnished. It would seem reasonable to assume that with so large a proportion of the family's food provided without direct purchase, the housewife might have considerable difficulty in estimating accurately what her family consumed during the past 12 months.

^{4.} Atwater, W. O. and Bryant, A. P. 1899. The Chemical Composition of American Food Materials.
U. S. Dept. Agr., Off. Exp. Sta., Bul. 28. Reprinted 1906. 87 p.

Another possible source of error lies in the watte which may be included in the figures given by the ferm families. The food which is thrown out to the chickens and hogs may not be a waste from the fermer's standpoint, but from the point of view of the femily's food consumption it must certainly be counted as waste. Another source of waste is in the spoilage that occurs in stored foods, such as fruit and vegetables. It would doubtless be difficult for the housewife on the farm to estimate with accuracy the amount of waste from these sources, and the error here would probably be in the direction of overstatement of food consumption.

A number of studies are needed before we can know the extent to which these possible sources of error have expanded the figures on food consumption it nere presented. But/is probable that even when sufficient allowance is made for them, the average farm dist will still be seen to provide an abundance of most of the nutrients required. The problem is not so much one of the amount of food consumed as of the balance between the various foodstuffs. This is primarily a problem of education rather than of ability to pay, since the foods which tend to be over or under consumed are usually furnished by the farm itself.

When we pass, however, from the average diet to the diet of the individual farm families a more serious situation will probably appear in a large proportion of the cases.

Food Habits on the Farm and in the City

In attempting to evaluate the figures presented in this report it will be well to compare them with food consumption figures collected by other investigators. There are two such studies suitable for comparison. In both of these 90 (8-5-26)

the data were collected by the survey method, as in this study, and the figures represent estimates of feed consumption made by the housewife. W. C. Funk made a study of the food consumed by 950 farm families in 14 states in 1912-14; and the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics made a detailed study of the consumption of 128 foodstuffs in its cost of living study made in 1918-19, in which were included 11,500 workingments families from 92 localities in 42 states.

In making a comparison of the results of the three studies, it is necessary to use the figures for the adult-male unit. Since the energy scale used by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics gives consumption figures about 8 per cent higher than the one used in this study, its figures were lowered by that amount. In Funk's study only two divisions were made in the dietary scale, children of 12 years of age and under being counted as one-half an adult-male unit and all persons over 12 years of age as requiring the same food as an adult-male unit. Since for his families this gives results similar to those obtained by the energy scale used in the present study, no adjustment was made in Funk's figures.

The nutrients furnished by the diets reported by Funk for the average farm family and by the United States Dureau of Labor Statistics for the average workingman's family, as well as the distribution of energy among the different food groups, were calculated by the writer and are included in Tables 1 and 2.

^{5.} Funk, W. C.
1916. Válue to farm families of food, fuel, and use of house.
U. S. Dept. Agr. Bul. 410, 36 p., illus.

^{6.} United States Department of Labor, Eurecu of Labor Statistics
1924. Cost of living in the United States. U. S. Dept. Labor, Bur.
Labor Statis. Bul. 357, 466 p.

^{90 (8-5-26)}

No attempt was made to find the number of adult-male units in terms of protein and mineral requirement in the two studies. The figures for protein and minerals, therefore, are higher than they would have been if the double scale employed in this study had been used.

Because the present study and the one made by Funk show the food habits of farm families we should expect rather close agreement between them. And for the nutrients this is in general the case. The figures for Funk's study in Table 1 show that the average food consumed on the farm furnished about 30 to 55 per cent more nutrients than were estimated as needed. These results agree rather well with those obtained in the present study. If allowance is made for the fact that Funk's protein and mineral values are calculated on a higher basis than those in the present study, we find the greatest difference in the calcium content of the two diets. This is explained by the fact, shown in Table 2, that 65 per cent more milk and cream was used in the four states presented here than by the families studied by Funk.

Other differences also appear in the distribution of energy among the various food groups. The families studied by Funk consumed considerably less meat, eggs, and cheese, and somewhat more cereals, fruits, and vegetables. The distribution of energy among the fatty foods and sweets, however, is similar in the two studies. Within the food groups the outstanding differences occur in beef, pork, bacon, eggs, potatoes, and dried beans. Funk's families consumed about 20 per cent less pork and bacon and 30 per cent fewer eggs than the families included in our study, and 100 per cent more beef, 40 per cent more white potatoes, and almost three times as many sweet potatoes and dried beans.

When the average farm diet is compared with that of the workingman's 90 (8-5-26)

family in the city, as shown in the study made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1913-19, greater differences appear. Instead of an excess of mutritive factors in the workingman's diet there is a deficit in every case except protein. The average consumption figures for this diet yield 17 per cent less energy, 16 per cent less calcium, 15 per cent less iron, and 10 per cent less phosphorus than is estimated as needed. The protein figure just meets the estimated requirement.

The difference between the workingman's diet and that of the farmer is caused not by differences in consumption figures for one or two foods, but by the fact that practically all the foodstuffs are consumed in smaller quantities by the workingman's family. The amount of beef consumed by his family was, to be sure, twice as great as that reported by the farm families in the present study, but the latter consumed from two to four times as much pork, becon, poultry, eggs, and milk. If the other table and cooking fats used by the workingman's family are included with the butter and lard, the consumption of these foodstuffs is similar in the two groups. Only half as much sugar and sirup is used by the workingman's family. Purchased bread is of much greater importance in the workingman's diet, but when these figures are expressed as flour it appears that his consumption of this foodstuff is only 25 per cent greater than that of the farmer. Practically all of the fruits and vegetables appear in much larger quantities in the diet of the farm families.

These differences are expressed in another way in Tables 1 and 2. The total energy of the food consumed by the workingman's family is about 37 per cent below that of the average farm family. The proportion of energy

furnished by meat, eggs, cheese, mill, and cream is lower and that yielded by coreals is considerably higher in the workingson's diet. The total energy furnished by the six food grows is higher in all cases in the farm diet.

We would probably not be justified in concluding from these results that the workingmen's families actually consume 27 per cent less food than the farm families. The differences may be caused in part by the suitability of the survey method for collecting data from the two types of families. The results that were obtained indicate that the method is possibly better adapted to getting accurate figures from the workingman's family than from the farm family. This/suggested by the fact that the average workingman's diet approaches somewhat nearer the standard that was adopted than does the diet of the average farm family. This difference is probably caused to a large extent by the purchasing habits of the two groups. The workingman purchases practically all his food. On the basis of calories the farm family purchases about 40 per cent of the food consumed by the family and on the basis of cost 35 per cent. It is only reasonable to conclude that the housewife on the farm would be able to estimate the family's food consumption less accurately than the housewife who goes out to buy all her food,

In the matter of waste the emount is probably greater on the farm due to the table waste which is thrown out to the chickens and hogs, and the spoilage of stored foods. It is quite possible that the farm housewife found it difficult to make suitable deductions for these losses, which would probably account in part for the higher estimates given by her.

There may also be a difference in the quality of some of the foodstuffs used by the two groups, resulting in a difference in the amount of refuse

obtained in preparing them for the table. The foodstuffs which are sold in the city markets are usually fairly well graded, while the farm families may have kept for their own use a supply which is less uniform in size and quality. If such a variation exists, it would further explain the marked difference in nutritive value between the two diets.

Careful studies of the food consumption of the two groups would probably show, however, that the meat, eggs, milk, cream, fruit, and vegetable consumption of the farm family is higher than that of the workingman's family and that the consumption of cereals is somewhat lower. The proportion of energy derived from the fatty foods and sweets is probably similar in the two groups.

Food Costs

As was stated above the prices given by the farm families for furnished and purchased foods were not on the same basis. Those recorded on the schedule for purchased foods were the prices paid by the housewife at the grocery or market, The foods furnished by the farm were valued at prices somewhere between what would have been received had they been sold and what would have been paid had they been purchased in the local market. Because of this difference the proportion of a given foodstuff which was purchased is not always the same in Tables 5 t) 9 when expressed in value or cost and in pounds. For twenty-five foodstuffs in Table 9 the per cent of total value purchased is from 1 to 18 per cent greater than the per cent of total pounds purchased. This indicates that the furnished prices used for these foods were lower and in some cases considerably lower than the purchased prices. In only five cases is there evidence of a higher price used for furnished foods than for purchased. On the whole, therefore, the method of evaluating the foods furnished by the farm gives prices lower than those paid in the local market for 90 (8-5-26)

purchased foods. This discrepency, of course, affects the figures for total cost of food, but a comparison of total costs in the different states is probably justified because the differences that occur in pricing the foodstuffs are similar. Any conclusions concerning cost, however, are tentative because of these variations. Since the period of time covered by the studies in the four states is practically the same, no adjustment is made for changes in the price level.

In Table 3 the average value of the food consumed per family in the various states is compared with the average value of all family living. It appears that in Kansas the farm family spent the largest proportion for food. The average food consumed here absorbed 42 per cent of the total family living. The least relative amount was expended in Ohio and Missouri where 37 to 38 per cent of the total family living went for food. The largest actual amount both for food and for family living was spent in Missouri. Here almost three-fourths of the food was furnished by the farm. In Ohio where the largest proportion—39 per cent— was purchased the least was expended per family for food.

An average of all the states indicates that 40 per cent of the average value of all family living went for food, one—third of which was purchased. Funk in his study of farm families found that 42 per cent of the value of the food consumed by the average family was purchased. His method of pricing furnished foodstuffs was similar to the one used in the study reported here. He states that average farm prices were used in arriving at the value of the food furnished by the farm. Since he included only the food, fuel, and use of house in his study a comparison can not be made between the proportion of total family living expended for food in the two farm studies. Among the

workingmen's families studied by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1918-19 an average of 28 per cent of the total expenditures was spent for food. This is somewhat lower than the proportion expended on the ferm.

Table 3. Average value of the food consumed per family during one year and its proportion of the average value of all family living on 1331 farms of selected localities in Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio. 1922-1923

The state of the s	The state of the s	Averag of hou			months and a consequence of the constitution o	Food	-	e ne alminimo al lucidos que la companio de la companio del companio de la companio de la companio del companio de la companio del la companio de la compani
	Families included	Persons	Adult- male units for energy	Average value of all family living	Average value per family	Proportion of average value of all family living	Propo	
	Number	Number	Number	\$	\$	Per cent	Per	cent
Kansas	406	4.6	4,3	1492	632	42		36
Kentucky	365	4,3	4.3	1483	596	40		29
Missouri	178	4.3	4.0	1897	717	38		27
Ohio	382	4,4	4,0	1541	570	37		39
All 4 state	es 1331	4,4	4.2	1559	616	40		33

The total cost of food per man per year in the different states and the proportion spent for the various food groups are presented in Table 4. The average yearly food bill for the four states was \$147 per adult-male unit, 59 per cent of which went for animal foods and 41 per cent for vegetable. The difference in this allocation would probably be somewhat greater if retail prices had been used throughout because of the effect the price-method that 90(8-5-26)

Table 4. Average value of the food consumed per man per year on 1331 farms of selected localities in Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio, and the distribution of value among the various food groups 1922-1923

1	and the second of the second second		The second secon	And in company of the same also and the same		ed in months of the standard of		A STATE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN PARTY OF THE PERSON NAMED IN	of street, observation consum.	, , , , ,					,
Total Mc	¥-6	Meat, eggs	855 010	Milk Cream	N E	Foods	ty	Streets	ω	Cereals	als	· Fruits Vegetables		Miscéllan- eous	lan-
per man per year		€9-	% of total	\$	% of total	₩.	% of total value	\$	% of total value	•	% of total value	& D	% of total value	€9-	% of total value
149.93		42,81		30.94	21	16.04	11	9,43	9	14.75	10	28.11 19 7.85 5	19	7.85	ιΩ
138,19		40.95	8	29 94	223	17,20	123	8.79	(O	12.99	91	20.97	E L	7.36	က
175.92		47.35	27	43,66	25	17.76	.01	6.94	9	15.52	<u>о</u>	33,65		19 8.05	4
140.37		38,56	88	17.37	, st.	17.33	13	10.31	₽-	15.20	Ħ	34.06	24	7,44	гo
147.42		41,69	28	28.47	19 16,96	16.96	12	9,58	2	14,50	01	28.60 19 7.62	19	7.62	5
											•		•		

was used had on pork, bacon, lard, eggs, milk, and cream (all animal foods) and because of the importance of these foods in the farm diet. The proportions spent for the various food groups are: 28 per cent for meat, eggs, and cheese; 19 per cent for milk and cream; 12 per cent for fatty foods; 19 per cent for fruits and vegetables; 10 per cent for cereals; and 12 per cent for other foods.

It appears that the largest amount spent for food expressed in terms of the adult-male unit was in Missouri, where \$176 per year was expended. In Mentucky only \$138 was spent per man per year, a difference of more than 20 per cent. This difference is apparently not due to the price irregularity, for in both states similar amounts of food were purchased—29 per cent in Kentucky and 27 per cent in Missouri. In Kansas and Chio, where intermediate amounts were spent for food, the proportion purchased was considerably higher—36 and 39 per cent, respectively. The proportion spent on the various food groups is similar in Kansas, Kentucky, and Missouri. In Ohio only slightly more was spent for animal foods than for vegetable. This was caused largely by the lower milk and cream consumption and the higher consumption of vegetables and fruit.

A comparison of the average food cost for the families included in this study with that of the farm families studied by Funk shows that his families spent somewhat less for food. Food costs were 46 per cent higher in 1923 than

^{7.} The prices used for these furnished foods were: pork 13 cents per 1b.; bacon 7 cents per 1b.; land 8 cents per 1b.; eggs 20 cents per doz.; milk 7 cents per qt.; cream 17 cents per pint. These prices are considerably below the retail price as given by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The prices used for furnished fruits, vegetables, and cereals were in closer agreement with published retail prices.

they were in 1912-1914, the years covered by Funk's study. After adjusting his calus - \$74 per man per year - for this difference in price level we find that his families spent an average of \$137 per man per year as against \$147 for the families reported here. This is a difference of 7 per cent. In both studies practically the same proportion was spent for animal foods - 58 per cent of Funk's families, 59 per cent by those included in the present study.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics makes no analysis of the distribution of the food costs for the workingman's family. When the total expenditure for food, \$155 per man per year in 1918, is adjusted to provide for differences in price level, however, we find that his food would have cost the working man \$133 per adult-male unit in 1923. This is approximately 10 per cent less than the figure for the farm families in this study. But if the value of the food furnished by the farm is adjusted so that it corresponds with the cost of purchased foods, the farm diet would be valued at about \$175, On this basis the workingman's food cost approximately 24 per cent less than the farmer's. Yet it yielded 37 per cent less energy. It would seem therefore that on either basis the diet of the workingman is relatively more expensive. These figures, suggesting as they do that the farmer has a distinct economic advantage over the city workingman in his food supply, need further analysis and interpretation.

^{8.} United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics 1925.

Retail prices. U. S. Dapt. Labor, Bur. Labor Statis. Bul. 366: 4 and 49

^{90 (8-5-26)}

Table 5. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 406 farm families of selected localities of Kansas during the year ending December 31. 1923.

Kind of foodstuff	Aver		Aver	226	Propo		Families
ALIA OI LOCASIALI		adult	per fa		purc	hased : Value	using
		unit Value		Value	TIDS:	· 40.00	Number
Meat, fish, eggs	, 22,004		. 21009	Value			: 17011301
Beef	1 770 79	\$ 6,43	1 = 1	dan 00	. 1.77	. 47	318
			151	, ,	43		
Matton (C.4	80.					12
Pork	64.8						391
Poultry		12.50	156	,	0		391
Veal	4	1,47	35	•		,	76
Other meat			· •				2
Fish	4.5				96		306
Eggs	; 114.8	13.13	484	55.40	0	, 0	400
Milk, cream, cheese			, ,		t. 1	4	1
Whole milk	: 632, 8	16.78	2669	70.78	0	; 0	404
Canned milk	-	· -	_	-	-	-	
Cheese	2.1	. 64	9	2.71	55	71	163
Cream	72.9	14.16				0	304
Patty foods							:
Bacon, salt pork	24.5	2,18	103	9.21	12	44	390
Butter		12.11				1	392
Other table fats		0.16			3		37
Lard	15.2		64		21	38	394
Other cooking fats	0,2	.04	1		ł	,	11
Peanut butter	1,1	.27	5			1	202
Salad oils	0,1	.02		0,08			31
ugar, sirups	. 0, 1	• 02		0,00	100	200	
Honey	0.9	.21	٠ ٧٠	0.89	50	50	104
				0.00			30
Maple sirup		,05					
Molasses	2.2	. 22	9	0.92	92	96	109
	14.2	.71		2.97			291
Sugar, granulated		7.83					400
Sugar, brown	4.4	• 40	18	1.71	100	100	277
ereals							
Bread	12,2	1,18			100		248
Corumeal	10.7	.37	45	1,57		99	319
Cornstarch	1.2	.14	5	0,60	100	100	275
Flour, white	221.8	8,03			98	98	403
Flour, whole wheat	6.9	.26		1,11	93	95	: 194
Flour, other	1.2	.12	5 .	0.48	90 :	96	72
Macaroni, noodles	1,2	. 26	6:	1.10	100	100	289
Rice	3,9	.40	17.	1.69	100	100	358
Rolled oats	12,5	1.00	53		100:	100	321
Other cereals	13.1	1,33	55 :	5,60	96		363
Other baked goods	7.6	1.66	32	7.03	100	100	382
ruit	03.6	2 40	700	70 55		00	700
Fresh: Apples	91.6	2.46	386	10.35	64	69	388
Bananas	7.3	.91	31	3.85	100	100	363
Berries	7.1	,90	30 ;	3,81:	18	23	248
Cherries	18.5	.55	78	2.33	25	27	215

Table 5. Cont*d. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 406 farm families of selected localities of Kansas during the year ending December 31, 1925.

ending December 31, 192	3.						
	Avera	ge.			Prop	ortion	
	per a	-	Avera			hased	Families
Kind of foodstuff	_male r		per f	amily	Lbs.	Value	using
		Value	Lbs.	Value	40	6	Number
Grapes	7.3	\$.38		\$ 1.57	27	30	193
Lemons	4.1	. 58	17	2.44	100	100	373
Melons	43.4		183	5.50	20	28	240
Oranges, grapefruit	11.2	.98	47	4.14	100	100	376
Peaches	36.6	1.17	1 54	4,93	33	37	268
Pears	10.1	•32	42	1.35	59	64	170
Rhubarb	2.5	.13	11	0.53	5	7	157
Other fresh fruit	23.3		98	3.07	67	74	297
Canned:	3.9			4.36	100	100	230
Dry: Prunes	1.5	.27			100	100	215
Raisins	3.7		16	2.76		100	347
Other dry fruits	0.8	.16	3	0.68	100	100	96
Vegetables							1
Fresh: Beens	9,4			2,25	5	6	353
Beets	9.7						326
Cabbage, cauliflower	32.5					49	330
Carrots Celery	2.1	.04		0.20		13	114
Corn	2.2	,26		1.08		99	218
Cucumbers	32.3					1	322
Lettuce, greens	19,9	. 49		2.07		3	277
Onions	6.9			2.63	6	9	340
Peas	18.4			3.67		12	389
Potatoes	16.7	, 33				2 27	312 402
Sweet potatoes	18.7	.55	1130	24.13		60	250
Squash, pumpkin	4.7			2,35		5	123
Tomatoes	52.2			0.89 4.73		4	361
Turnips	2.9		12	0.29	5	5	71
Other fresh veg.	10.4			2.32	1		355
Canned:	9.6						313
Dry: Peas, beans	16.2			3,86	91	91	316
Miscellaneous				0,00			
Chocolate, cocoa	1.8	.48	8	2.06	100	100	384
Coffee	8,4	3,33				100	392
Extracts	0.4			1.88		100	382
Gelatin	0.3	.21	1	0.90	100	100	226
Olives, pickles	0.4			0.58	100	100	103
Peanuts	1.2	. 21		0.91		95 .	244
Other nuts Salt	3,2	.40		1.69 1.81		85	31 1
Soda, baking powder	3,0	.43	71 13	2.61	100	100	384 402
Spices	1.9	.30	8	1.29	100	100	380
Tea	1.0	. 53	4	2.22:	100	100 :	331
Vinegar	9.5	. 54	40	2,28	88	91 :	381
Yeast Other foods	0.4	14	2	0.60	100	100 :	196
Total	-	149.93	-	0.32 632.40	100	100 :	24
90(8-5-26)	.2288.7*			0000		-	
00 (0-2-20)							

Table 6. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 365 farm families of selected localities of Kentucky during the year ending July 1, 1923

4	Avera	go.			Propor	tion	1 1
Kind of foodstuff	Per a		A 7707	rage			Families
100000000000000000000000000000000000000		unit		family		Value	using
1		Value		Value	%	%	Number
Meat, fish, eggs.	Tion	value	وداللا	varue	/0	<u> </u>	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Beef	12.1	\$2,79	52	\$12,04	66	75	242
Mutton	0.7	. 24	3	1.03	17	12	15
Pork	127.1	19.09	549	82.36	i	1	358
Poultry	27.7	8.34	120	35.98	i	1	360
Veal	1.2	.27	5	1.17	75	65	30
Other meat			_			-	-
Fish	3.7	•98	16	4.22	92	93	303
Eggs	50.2	8.07	217	34, 83	0	. 0	357
Milk, cream, cheese Whole milk	00.0	0.01	, ~ , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	0-14 00			1
	528.9	25,10	2282	108.29	0	. 0	352
Skim milk	1.0	.07	4	0.32	0	. 0	1
Cheese	4.2	1,17	18	5.05	30	53	215
Cream Fatty foods	36.2	4.77	156	20,59	. 0	0	209
Bacon, salt pork	46.1	3,66	199	15.81	2	6	359
Butter	30,9	10.41	133	44.90	1	1	351
Other table fats	_	-	_	0.01	100	100	2
Lard	27.4	2.63	118	11.37	9	16	361
Other cooking fats		_	d was	-	100	100	1
Peanut butter	1.3	.40	6	1.74	100	100	243
Salad oils	0.3	.09	1	0.39	100	100	33
Sugar, sirups							
Honey	2.1	•38	9	1.60	46	37	105
Maple sirup	0.2	• 03	1	0.12	100	100	10
Molasses	7.1	.51	30	2.21	100	100	183
Sirup, corn	1.2	•06	5	0.27	100	100	44
Sugar, granulated	82.0	7.38	354	31.96	100	100	365
Sugar, brown	4.6	.43	20	1.86	100	100	223
Cereals		7 00	10	4 07	700	700	220
Bread	11.2	1.08	49	4.67	100	100	272
Cornmeal	44.4	1.18	191	5,10	19	9	327
Cornstar ch Flour, white	0,2	.02 8.24	1 834	0.08 35.57	100 95	100	5 1 360
Flour, whole wheat	6,6	. 24	28	1.03	82	52	16
Flour, other	0,3	.03	1	0,13	92	92	31
Macaroni, noodles	1.3	27	6	1.15	100	100	302
Rice	1.8	17	8	0.74	100	100	292
Rolled oats	4.4	.39	19	1.71	100	100	223
Other cereal	3,1	.31	13	1,35	100	100	189
Other baked goods	5.4	1.06	23	4,56	100	100	343
Fruit		1					
Fresh: Apples	77.8	2.00	336	8,63	30	36	334
Bananas	6.5	. 80	28	3.47	100	100	329
Berries	13.7	.90	59	3,90	11	17	327
Cherries	2.2	.34	. 10	1.46	14	10	130
90(8-5-26)	:	1			• •	:	
		1		,	6 1	:	

Table 6. Contid. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 365 farm families of selected localities of Kentucky during the year ending July 1, 1923

ending July 1, 1923					pur a mantanan . manar n		and the second s
	Avera	see :			Propo	rtion	
	per ac		Averag	70 ·		hased	Pamilies
Kind of foodstuff	male 1			mily		Value	
	Lbs.		Lbs,	Value	3	01	Number
Grapes			Appropriate a construction of the construction			removed and	1.89
	6.4	\$.19		\$ 0,82	2	2	
Lemons	3,1	,47	13	2,05	100	100	728
Melons	32.7	,98	141	4,24	03	80	234
Oranges, grapefruit	11.4	. 81	49	5,51	100	100	331
Peaches	27.0	.74	116	5.21	17	18	265
Pears	10.1	,21	44	0,92	19	15	1.30
Rhubarb	1.4	.12	6	0.49	10	12	11.9
Other fresh fruit	17.2	, 45	74	1,98	28	29	254
Canned: Dry: Prunes	1.5	.37	7	1.56	100	100	127
Raisins	0.4		2	0.38	100	1.00	
· ·	0.7	. 20	3	0,85	100	100	221
Other dry fruit	0.4	°03	2	0.35	100	700	100
Vegetables				1			
Fresh: Beans	30.0	1.31	129	5, 65	2	3	359
Beets	6.3	.12	28	0,51	ò	. O	312
Cabbage, cauliflower		1.40	178	6.04	4	: 4	
Carrots	C.3	0,01	1	0.02	0	0	24
Celery	1.9	,15	8	0, 66	49	54	122
Corn	45.3	1.51	195	6, 53	2	1	344
Cucumbers	7.1	22	30	0.96	5	5	141
Lettuce, greens	3,5	.21	15	0, 83	5	7	339
Onions	13.3	.31	57	1.34	1	1	354
Poas	3,4	. 44	15	1,89	1	1	324
Potatoes	159.1	3,19	687	15,75	29	33	363
Sweet potatoes	20.4	•46	88	1,93	9	12	240
Squash, pumpkin	7.5	.20	32	0,86	0	0	183
Tomatoes	79.7	. 86	344	: 3.71	1	1	352
Turnips	3,8	_* 06	16	0,27	1	1	119
Other fresh veg.	5.4	: ,14	24	0,62	0	0	280
Canned:	3,4	.54	15	2, 35	100	100	159
Dry: Peas, beens	10.9	: 1.09	47	4.69	52	61	500
Miscellaneous		1					
Chocolate, cocoa	1.1	45	: 5	1,92	1.00	100	293
Coffee	9.9	3.15	43	13.59	100	1.00	56.2
Extracts	0.4	. 46	2	1,95	1.00	100	555
Gelatin	0.1	407	eme .	0,29	100	. 100	07
Olives, pickles	0.4	.18	2	0.75	1.00	100	3.1
Peanuts	0.4	.08	1	0,35	100	100	, Ja
Other nuts	: 0.8	.14	3	0.63	100	100	11.0
Salt	27.0	• 55	116	2,39	, 200	100	1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Soda, baking powder	5.0	. , 93	21	3.99	100	100	505
Spices	0.6	: .16	3	0.71	100	3.00	5-17.
Tea	0.7	. 49	. 3	2.13	100	1.00	. 203
Vinegar	8.6	. 62	37	2.69	94	95	560
Yeast	0.1	.05	1	. 21	100	1.00	126
Other foods	940	.02	test.	08		100	2
Total	1978.4#	138.19	:	596,34	;	29	i
90(8-5-26)			1	1			
	:		:	* 6			

Table 7. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 178 farm families of selected localities of Missouri during the year ending December 31, 1923.

	Aver	-				rtion	
Kind of foodstuff		dult	Aver	age	Tibs.	nasea Value	Families using
Aind of foodstate	male_	unit	per_i	amily	1	The same of	USIUS
And the second s	108,	Value	Lbs.	Value_	- 79	1/2	·numper
Meat, fish, eggs					•		
Beef		\$ 4,82		\$19,63			1
Mutton	1.2	. 24	5	0.98	37	46	
Pork	111.5	13,36	454	54,40	3	7	174
Poultry	50,5	13,59	206	55,36	. 0	0	176
Veal	2,2	, 53	9	2.14	27	20	15
Other meat	6×20	_		ane	1 0 90-r		91.00
Fish	6,8	1.44	28	5, 84		91	138
Eggs		11.67		47,53		0	176
Milk, cream, cheese					:	:	
Whole milk	703.3	28, 18	2865	114.73	. 0	0	167
Canned milk	les les	1 20, 40					
Cheese	7.5	1.71	50	6,93	13		
Cream	83.9	15,48	719	63.05	: 0		
Fatty foods	0000	20,20	0-20	00.00			الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الله
	40.0	0 74	7.00	7776			170
Butter	40.8	2.74				19	
	31.6	12,70					
Other table fats	-	-			100		
Lard	24.7	1.92					
Other cooking fats	0.1	0.03	900		100	100	
Peanut butter		0.29	5	1.19	100	100	
	0,3	0.07	1	0.28	100	100	, 26
Sugar, sirups	:		6		;		
Honey	1.5	0.51					
Maple sirup	0,7	0.18		0.73			
Molasses	6.6	0,63	27				
Sirup, corn	5,4	0.34		1.57	100	100	
Sugar, granulated	: 79.2	7,36	322	31,20	: 100	100	
Sugar, brown	6.1	0.62	25	2.50	: 100	100	134
Cereals	i		, ,		2	:	
Bread	27.3	2.67.	111	20,88	100	1.00	133
Cornmeal	19.5	0.61	79	2 16	. 07	SS	152
	0.7	0,10	5	0,40	100	100	91
	189.7	7.96	773	32.42	: 8.4	84	
Flour, whole wheat	4.1	0.21	17	0,87			
Flour, other	1.0	0.10	4	0. 43	1000	1 00	
		0.39		1.59	100	100	
Rice	2.0	0,38	17	1.57	. 700	3.00	
		0.82		Z. 36	12.36	,	
Other cereal	7.2	0.78	30				
Other baked goods			4			t and the second	
	7.8	1,49	32	6,06	100	. 2.70	
Fruit	1700 17	1 0 00	i mour	77 (10)	·		7 07
Fresh; Apples	192,5	2,93	783	11,93	20	51	
Bananas	6.5	0.69 2.54	27			1	
Berries	24,2	2.54	99	10.36			3.57
Cherries	23.2	1.07	9.4	4.37	20	20	150

Table 7. Contid. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 173 farm families of selected localities of Missouri during the year ending December 31, 1923

	~~						-
	Ave	rage			Proport	ion	
Vind of fact to		adult	Avera		purcha		Families
Kind of foodstuff		unit	ber r	amily	1	Value	using
		Value	Lbs.	: Value	5	%	Number
Grapes		\$ 0.48	60	\$ 1.95	4	6	104
Lemons	4.6		: 13	2,01	100	100	147
Melons	35.4	1.18	160	4.81	50	22	103
Oranges, grapefruit			42	4.04	100	100	153
Peaches	36.1	0.96	147	3.88	11	13	123
Pears	38.7		158	2.55	16	16	133
Rhubarb	2.2		9	1.20	9	10	: 86
Other fresh fruit	17.1	0,54	69	2,19	24	24	111
Canned:	1.9	0.53	8	2.14	100	100	33
Dry: Prunes	0.8	0.16	3	0,67	100	100	61
Raisins	2.0		8	1.70	100	100	143
Other dry fruit	0.3	0,06	1	0.24	100	100	19
Vegetables				* !	1	* } !	
Fresh: Beans	70.3	1.96	286	7.97	1	1	170
Beets	9.7	0.29	40	1.19	1	1	152
Cabbage, cauliflow			208	6.83	5	6	: 164
Carrots	2.4	0.09	10	0.58	2	2	55
Celery	3.6	0.33	14	1.36	77		100
Corn	46.2	1.07	188	4.25	1	1	161
Cucumbers	23.8	0.47	97	1.94	1	10	162
Lettuce, greens Onions	10.0		41	5.58	7	4	167
Peas	13.4	0.71	54	2.91 1.78	6	Ö	140
Potatoes	219.9	0.44	896	19,20	8		175
Sweet potatoes	31.5		128	3,94	10	9	137
Squash, pumpkin	11.1	0,53	45	2.16	10	1	92
Tomatoes	93.9		382	6,54	ī	î	171
Turnips	14.5		59	1.25	12	12	116
Other fresh veg.	12.9		53	3.78	1	2	161
Canned:	7.1		29	6,23	100	100	106
Dry: Peas, beans	11.0		45	2,92	84	62	141
Miscellaneous	1 3	•	1 1 2	a B 1			*
Chocolate, cocoa	2.0	0.62	8	2.52	100	100	165
Coffee	8.0	3,08	33	12,55	100	100	
Extracts	0.4		2	1.85	100	100	
Gelatin	0.2		1	0.86	100	100	110 53
Olives, pickles Peanuts	0.6		2 4	1,08 0,50	100 100	100	62
Other nuts	3.3		13	1,46	100		108
Salt	22,2	0.51	91	2,07	100		
Soda, baking powde:			17	3,15	100		172
Spices	1.5	0.34	6	1,37	100		158
Tea	0.8	0.44	3	1.79	100 :	100	132
Vinegar	12.7		52	2,81	44	44	157
Yeast	0.2		1	0,30	100	100	61
Other foods	_	125 00	-	716.52	(40)	37 27	14
Total 90(3-5-26)	2631.0*	T10.30	* ,	716.52		21	
30(0-0-0)							

Table 8. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 382 farm families of selected localities of Chio buring the year ending October 1, 1923.

00 00 ber 1, 1923.							•
	Averag	·e ·	<u> </u>		Prenor	fion	1
Kind of foodstuff	per ad	ult	Avera	ge		asad	[Families
· ·	male v		per fa		ins.	Value	using
	Lbs.	Value	Lbs.	Talue	%	%	Number
Meat, fish, eggs		1	1		-	1	I
Beef :	32.1	\$ 5.92	7.77	\$ 24.09	5 7	63	363
Mutton	1.2	0,21	5	0,85		24	34
Pork	67.5	9,78	275	39.73			371
Poultry	23.4		95			1	379
Veal	2,3		10	1,50		•	45
Other meat	0,5	0.12	. 3	0.51		100	86
Fish	5.8	1,01	24				311
Eggs	53,9	11,03	219				374
Milk, cream, cheese	0090	, 22,00	213	44400			012
Whoie milk	467.8	12,44	1902	50,53	1	1	379
Canned milk	***		-	0.01		,	2
Cheese	5.7	1.20	23	4,86		66	290
Cream	50.2	4.94	123	20.06		1	148
Fatty foods				20103	-		
Bacon, salt pork	24.7	2, 25	100	9,15	12	34	379
Butter	32.1	13,00	150	52, 85		29	366
Other table fats	1.4	0.41	6	1.66		100	48
Lard	15.1	1.35	62	5,50		30	372
Other cooking fats	0,1	0.02	\$100 EVA	0.06		100	7
Peanut butter	1.2	0.28	5	1,14.		100	229
Salad oils	0.1	0.03		0.14		100	28
Sugar, sirups							
Honey	1.3	0,33 .	: 6	1,34	. 53	52	151
Maple sirup	3,8		16	2,83	7.1	, 69	113
Molasses	1,2		5	U. 64	100	100	88
Sirup, corn	5.8		24	1.91		100	177
Sugar, granulated	86.7	8,03	352	32,62		100	332
Sugar, brown Cereals	7.2	0.62	30	2,56	100	100	344
Bread							
	42.4	4.01	172	16, 28		100	347
Cornmeal Cornstarch	11.6		47	1,46		37	334
Flour, white	1.3	0.14	5	0.59	100	100	239
Flour, whole wheat	1613	6,58	, 656	26.75		34	376
Flour, other	2.2	0.10	9	0,38			80
Macaroni, noodles	2.5	0,24	10	0,97			175
Rice	1.2	0,25 0,33	5 14	1,01		100	276
Rolled oats	8,8	0,78	36	1,33 5,15	100	100	346 283
Other cereal	7,5	1.03	41	41, 22		97	328
Other baked goods	5.0	1,57	37	5, 62	100	100	369
Fruit	8	4 e 4					
Fresh: Apples	111,3	3,73	452	15, 18	52	54	376
Bananas	13.4	1.29	54	5,26	100	1.00	360
Berries	16,9	2.72	68	11.06		21	344
Cherries	11.5	1.16	47	4.73	23	26	307
90(8-5-26)	;						

Table 8. Contid. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed by 382 farm families of selected localities of Chio during the year ending October 1, 1923

	Aver	age	1		Proportion		
	per a		Average		purchased		Families
Kind of foodstuff	male unit			per family		Value	
	Lbs.	Value		Value	. %	: %	Number
Grapes	10.3	\$ 0.40	42	\$ 1,64	13	12	279
Lemons	3,8	0,52	16	2.10	100	100	371
Melons	44,9	1,35	182	5.46	61	47	312
Oranges, grapefruit	16,2		: 66		100	100	365
Peaches	24.2	1,06		4,53	79	80	335
Pears	19.2	0.47	78		24	27	250
Rhubarb	4.6	0.36	19		2	2	279
Other fresh fruit	18,2	0, 36	74		62	67	. 334
Canned:	1.7		7	1.83	100	100	135
Dry: Prunes	2.1	0.41	9	1.67	100	: 100	289
Raisins	2.5	0,47	10		100	100	355
Other dry fruit	0.4	0.12	2	0.48	100	100	79
Vegetables					•	:	
Fresh: Beans	13.9	0.70	57	2,83	3	: 4	367
Beets	8,1	0.14	33	0.57	: 0	. 0	331.
Cabbage, cauliflower	50.1	1.70	204	6,94	4	4	360
Carrots	1.3	0,02	6	0.09	3	3	102
Celery	9.0	0,63	37	2,57	49	51	280
Corn	76.2	1.67	310	6.79	1	1	375
Cucumbers	60.7	0.64	247	2.61	: 10	10	310
Lettuce, greens	7.8	1.05	31	4.27	13	21	360
Onions	16.0	0.84	: 65	3.40	13	10	: 372
Peas	10.1	0,44	41	1,77	2	2	310
Potatoes	257.8		1048	19.35	25	25	378
Sweet potatoes	21.2	0.55	86	2,26	81	81	257
Squash, pumpkin	13.1	0.50	53	2.04	2	2	288
Tomatoes	58.8	1.06	239	4.32	: 3	3	376
Turnips	5.4	0.07	22	0,30	6	8	185
Other fresh veg.	9,4	0,56	38	2.28	2	: 2	351
Canned:	4.4	0.77	18	3,13	100	100	204
Dry: Peas, beans	14.1	1,05	58	4, 29	51	46	363
Miscellaneous				•			
Chocolate, cocoa	1.5	0,45	6	1.82	100	100	352
Coffee	7.7	2.57	31	10,44	100	100	330
Extracts	0.3	0.44	1	1.78	100	100	378
Gelatin	0.2	0.16	1		100	100	160
Olives, pickles	0.2	0.10	1	0,39	100	100	96
Peanuts	1.6	0,29	6	1.16	100	100	229
Other nuts	4.3	0.25	17	1,00	93	96	206
Salt	10.5	0.44	43	1.77	100	100	381
Soda, baking powder	2.5	0.58	10	2,36	100	100	382
Spices	1.6	0.53	6	2,12	100	100	375
Tea	1.2	: 0,73	5	2,97	100	100 :	304
Vinegar	11.6	0,67		2.74	65	64	377
Yeast	0.4	0.15	: 2	0.62	100	100	204
Other foods		0.09	-	.36	100	100	42
Total	12104.5	140.27	•	570.18		39	
90(8-5-26)							

Table 9. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed during one year by 1331 farm families of selected localities of Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio. -- 1922-1923

2			-	-			,
	Average		,		Proportion		1
	per adult		Average		purchased		Families
Kind of foodstuff	male_unit						
				Value			Number
Meat, fish, eggs	11000	value	, TINS*	. V.1.1.U.S	/0	10	, Monnoer,
Beef	00.0		. 700	402.20			7000
	26, 2	\$ 5,05		\$21.10		52	1062
Mutton	0,8	0,79	4	0.77	24	27	76
Pork	89.4	12,21	374	51,03	5	7	1294
Poultry	32,3	10.47		43.76	0	0	1312
Veal	3,8	0.71		2,93		29	1
Other meat	0,2	0.04		0,15			1
Fish	4.9	1.04		4,34		,	1058
Eggs -							1307
	73.1	10,93	306	45.68	0	0	1307
Milk, cream, cheese		_					
Whole milk	566.9	19,42	2370	81,16	0	0	1302
Skim milk	0.3	0.02	1	.09	0	0	1
Canned milk	***	-	_		100	100	2
Cheese	4,4.	1,09	18	4,54		54	•
Cream	52.1	9.11	218	38.06			806
Fatty foods	ON L	بلابتد ۾ ح	210	36,00	0		: 500
Bacon, salt pork	75.0	0 70	7.00	77 00	~	64	7.000
	32.8	2,70	137	11,26			1298
Butter	32.6	11.96		49,99			1274
Other table fats	0.5	0,17	2	0.69	100	100	89
Lard	19.9	1.77	83	7.38	15	25	1301
Other cooking fats	0.1	0.02	i i	0.08		100	21
Peanut butter	1.2	0,31	5	1.31			
Salad oils	0.2	0.05	1	0.21		100	118
Sugar, sirups	. 0, 2	. 0,05	_	0.21	100	100	7.20
	3 4	0 55		7 57	4 ***	4.4	. 47.4
Honey	1,4	0.33		1.37		44	414
Maple sirup	1,5	0.24	6	1.01		75	163
Molasses	3,8	0.34	16	1,42		99	470
Sirup, corn	7.1	0,45	29	1.71	100	100	597
Sugar, granulated	79.5	7.74	332	32,35	100	100	1320
Sugar, brown	5,4	0,50	23	2.10		100	978
Cereals							
Bread	22,3	2.13	93	8,93;	100	100	1005
Cornmeal	21.6	0,62	90	2.63	41	40	1132
Cornstarch	0.9	0.11		0.43:		100	706
Flour, white	192.8	7.68		32,10	80 :	80	1315
Flour, whole wheat	5.2	0.21		0,85		75	342
Flour, other	1.3	0.12		0.50	94	98	324
Macaroni, noodles	1.3	0.28	6		1		1001
Rice	3.3	0.31	14	1,31	100		1131
Rolled oats	8.7	0.74	37		100	100	958
Other cereal	8.7		36		95		
Other baked goods	7.4	1,39	31		100		
Fruit	\$ 6 6 1 1	1,00	57.	5,00	100.	100	±200
Fresh: Apples	106.3	2.75	144	11.48	44	51	1268
Bananas			-1114	4,01			
Berries	8.7	0,96	36		100	18	
	13.9	1.62	58	6. 79			
Cherries	12.6	0.73	52	3.05	23	23	802
90(8-5-26)	1						

Table 9. Contid. Average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed during one year by 1331 farm families of selected localities of Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio -- 1922-1923

Kentucky, Missouri, and	Ohio	1922-192	3				
1	Avera	ge			Proportion		
	per adult		Average		purchased		Families
Kind of foodstuff	male unit		per family		Lbs.	Value	using
	Lbs.	Value	Lbs.	Value	%	%	Number
Grapes	8,8	\$ 0.34	37	\$ 1.44	12	15	
Lemons	3,8	0.52	16	2,18	100	100	
Melons	40.2	1.21	168	5.05	30	45	1
Oranges, grapefruit	12,5	1.08	52	4.52	100	100	
Peaches	30,4	0.99	127	4.15	36	43	
Pears	16,3	0.37	68	1.56	27	32	
Rhubarb	2.8	0.21	11	0.87	5	6	
Other fresh fruit	19.4	0.66	81	2.78	51	57	
Canned:	2,3	0.62	10	2,57	100	100	t contract to the contract to
Dry: Prunes	1.3	0,24	5	1.02	100	100	
Raisins	2,3	0.45	10	1.86	100	100	1066
Other dry fruit	0.5	0.12	2	0.47	100	100	294
Vegetables Fresh: Beans	24 5	0.00	100	4 77	2	3	1249
Beets	24.5	0.98	102	4.11	1	1	
Cabbage, cauliflower	8.3 42.3	0.17 1.34	35 177	0.71 5.59	13	13	1183
Carrots	1.4	0.03	6	0.14	6	7	· Control of the cont
Celery	4,2	0.34	18	1.43	60	65	720
Corn	50.1	1,21	209	5.04	1	1	1202
Cucumbers	28.2	0.45	118	1.90	6	6	841
Lettuce, greens	6.5	0.72	27	3.02	8	. 14	1201
Onions	15.6	0.68	65	2.85	. 9	9	1282
Peas	9.6	0.40	40	1.69	1	1	1086
Potatoes	228.2	4,61	954	19.25	24	25	1318
Sweet potatoes	21.6	0,58	90	2,43	44	44	
Squash, pumpkin	8,7	0.33	36	1.38	2	2	
Tomatoes	67.3	1.10	281	4,58	2	2	
Turnips	5,4	0,10	22	0.42	7	. 7	
Other fresh veg.	9.0	0.49	38	2.04	1	1 1	1147
Canned: Dry: Peas, beans	6.1	1.10	25	4.58	100	100	782
Miscellaneous	13.5	0,98	56	4.09	(~	. 00	1120
Chocolate, cocoa	1.5	0.48	7	2.02	100	100	1197
Coffee	8.6	3.03	36	12.69	100	100	1224
Extracts	0,4	0.45	2	1.87	100	: 100	1281
Gelatin	0,2	0.16	1	0.66	100	100	583
Olives, pickles	0.4	0.15	2 4	0.64	100	100	378 624
Peanuts Other nuts	1.1 2.9	0.19	12	1,17	96 77	98	771
Salt	18.7	0.47	78	1.99	100	100	1298
Soda, baking powder	3.6	0.71	15	2,99	100	100	1321
Spices	1.4	0.33	6	1.38	100	100	
Tea	0.9	0.56	4	2.35	100	100	
Vinegar	10.3	0.62	43	2.60	74	77	
Yeas t Other foods	0.3	0.11	1	0.46	100	100	58 7 82
Total		147.43		615.97		33	
90(8-5-26)	1 8 6	,,_,					
00(0-0-00)	•	:	:				

